

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF JORDAN
IN THE COUNTY OF SCOTT
September 15, 2020**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Present: Ryan Dahnert, Joe Thill, Dr. Chuck Cook, Derek Nelson, Shane Ahlbrecht, Tanya Velishek, Dr. Amanda Schuh

Also Present: Nathan Fuerst, Planner/Economic Development Specialist; Tom Nikunen, City Administrator; Reeve Needham, Planning Intern

Meeting called to order at 6:30 pm.

2.0 ADOPT AGENDA

Motion by Velishek, second Cook, to adopt the agenda. Vote all ayes. Motion carried.

3.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. August 15, 2020

Motion by Thill, second Nelson to approve the minutes as presented. Vote all ayes. Motion carried.

4.0 NEW BUSINESS

A. Review of Jordan Small Business Relief Fund Applications

Nikunen presented that the City received five applications and all are recommended by staff for EDA approval. Two other applications were received but they were ineligible to receive funds.

Dahnert inquired if there was a deadline for the funds to be spent. Nikunen responded that November 15th is the deadline after the applications had been open for two months.

Ahlbrecht asked how businesses were made aware of the grant. Fuerst replied that business owners were emailed and the information was posted to the Jordan Facebook page and the Jordan webpage under COVID-19 resources.

Schuh asked about the businesses that were not yet open. Nikunen responded that they were contacted and that they planned to open soon, citing the relief grant as the reason, and planned to use the funds for PPE.

Ahlbrecht inquired about the inclusion of daycares in the relief fund grant. Fuerst responded that they were eligible under a different program, but there has not yet been interest from daycares.

Nelson motions, Velishek seconds to approve the relief fund applications. Cook and Ahlbrecht abstained from the vote due to conflicts of interest. Vote all ayes. Motion carried.

B. Presentation on Downtown Master Vision

Fuerst presented that the Vision is a plan from 2013 that stemmed from residential growth and the adoption of downtown design standards. The recommendations of the Vision revolved around Land Use and Urban Design, Streetscape and Aesthetics, Organization and Marketing, Programming, Business Support, and Recruit, and Rehabilitation and Redevelopment. Since the Vision was adopted, there has been major progress including increased walkability, street trees, way-finding signage, and more. In total, 17 grants have been awarded since the Vision's adoption. Specifically, the Vision included a brewery and winery as desired businesses, and drew Roets Brewery to downtown Jordan. Fuerst gave examples of marketing and programming: Business of the Week, Ladies Night Out, Cinco de Mayo, and the Live, Shop, Dine campaign. Fuerst asked EDA if it was time to update the Vision to reflect the changes to downtown and citing concerns over the prescriptive nature of the Vision.

Dahnert asked about how the Vision was first developed. Nikunen said a grant was used along with EDA funds. Downtown business owners met along with the Planning Commission and City Council. There was an implementation committee after the Vision's adoption at first. The EDA reviews the Vision every year and make any necessary changes. Ahlbrecht asked about redevelopment and larger plans for downtown. Nikunen responded that it depends on the site and the owners, some do not want to redevelop or sell their property. Dahnert commented that the final hurdle is always financing.

Ahlbrecht asked about promotion of the progress made in Jordan. Nikunen responded that another video is in the works, with delays due to COVID. We used to do a "Progress in Jordan" update once a month and EDA members agreed this should continue.

Dahnert remarked that with all the progress that's been made and the age of the Vision, it should be updated, as it is the reference guiding document for EDA. Fuerst remarked that there is also the Comprehensive Plan and the EDA's Strategic Plan, which will be reviewed at next month's meeting.

Velishek commented that before the Vision can be put to bed, the City needs a plan in place to continue the positive progress. Thill mentioned that the City should advertise that Jordan is open for business, possibly by using foot counts from downtown business or sales numbers. Dahnert asked if the EDA had additional goals or should the remaining Vision goals be shifted to the EDA strategic plan. Cook commented that the plan should be kept simple and update the priorities. Fuerst recommended a less prescriptive plan to interpret the values of the Vision to the changing future. Dahnert requested to look at the Strategic Plan first and then regroup on the Vision discussion. Nikunen mentioned that the Vision isn't over, the funds are earmarked for 20 years. Additionally, a grant would be needed to update the Vision, as it was done by a firm in 2013. Dahnert recommended the EDA update the Vision after reviewing the Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan next month.

C. Presentation of Grants and Business Subsidies available

Fuerst presented on the city's tools for economic development to give an idea of the purpose of each tool and what funding is available. The Downtown Matching Grant encourages the beautification of exteriors, with 17 grants awarded so far. The Building Code Improvement Grant brings properties up to state building code. The Commercial Kitchen Revolving Loan offers up to \$50,000 per project in a low interest loan to create a commercial kitchen. So far only Mousse Winery has used the Commercial Kitchen Revolving Loan.

Nikunen explained that there was confusion about the Downtown Matching Grant language within the City Council. The recommendation was to clarify the 2:1 matching grant language for grants over \$10,000. Fuerst explained that currently, applicants must provide 1:1 matching funds for grants up to \$5,000 and must provide 2:1 matching funds for grants over \$10,000. Grants over \$10,000 are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Cook proposed the "case-by-case" language for larger grants. Nikunen proposed setting a firm cap on the grant funds. Dahnert questioned the ability of smaller grants to make substantial property improvements.

Nikunen said there was confusion on when a project is "completed" and when the funds would be dispersed. Dahnert asked if all the applicants required building permits. Fuerst explained that some projects, such as painting, may not require a permit but will still be inspected by staff to ensure its completion.

Cook commented that the City Council wants a maximum amount for the grant and proposed setting it at \$10,000, removing the "case-by-case" language. Nikunen mentioned that bigger projects have other tools at their disposal, including TIF and Tax Abatement. Velishek questioned why EDA wouldn't want the flexibility afforded with the case-by-case language. Cook mentioned that the City Council wanted this change. Velishek said while the Council denied a past EDA request, the EDA should remain flexible for each business' circumstances. Dahnert questioned how staff determined the recommendation to bring this to EDA. Nikunen responded that there was negative feedback from the Council and the program should be clarified. Dahnert questioned if the Council has ever denied a grant request under \$10,000. Nikunen responded no. Dahnert mentioned concern that case-by-case language can lead to favoritism.

Cook motion, second Ahlbrecht to amend the Downtown Matching Grant Program by removing case-by-case basis language and making other text changes as proposed by staff. Velishek and Schuh vote Nay. Motion Carries 5-2.

Dahnert inquired about what the issues were with grant funds request timing. Fuerst replied that the City had an applicant ask for different installments to different contractors while the project was still ongoing. For ease of staff resources, there should only be one payment at the completion of the project. Dahnert asked when a project is deemed complete. Nikunen explained that a building inspector signs off if a permit is required, otherwise the Planner makes the inspection. Dahnert directed staff to propose text changes to clarify the timing of payments and the applicant's responsibility for invoices and the definition of a completed project for next meeting.

5.0 OLD BUSINESS

6.0 MANAGEMENT REPORT

A. General Management Updates

Administrator Nikunen mentioned that the Sketch Plan for the Dakota comprising of 400-500 homes will be presented to the PRAC this month. The plan includes a variety of lot sizes and density within the development with varying levels of affordability. The goal is to start construction next spring or early summer. Additionally, there is a proposed text amendment to allow for a tow yard at Bobby and Steve's off Highway 169. The funding sources for the Highway 169 interchange was discussed as well.

Reeve Needham, Planning Intern, is a new member of the City's Planning Staff.

B. Next Meeting- October 20, 2020

7.0 CITY COUNCIL MEMBER UPDATE

Councilor Amanda Schuh reported that City Council denied an increase to the EDA budget.

Mayor Velishek reported that they were reviewing what will happen to the remaining funds if there are no more grant applicants.

8.0 COMMISSION MEMBER REPORT

Ahlbrecht asked for more information on the EDA budget and historical spending. Fuerst mentioned that this can be added to next month's agenda.

9.0 ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Cook, second Nelson, to adjourn at 8:17 pm. Vote all ayes. Motion carried.

Tanya Velishek, Mayor

ATTEST:

Tom Nikunen, City Administrator